

### **REMARKS**

Claim 8 has been cancelled without prejudice to applicants' right to file an appropriate divisional application.

The rejection of claims 7 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is respectfully traversed. These claims did not refer to "shaping of air" but instead called for the air to be disposed so as to have a diamond shape. Nevertheless, for increased clarity without changing the scope of these claims, the language has been modified to recite that the air is disposed in a diamond shaped space. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully solicited.

The rejection of claims 1-6 and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over Sheinut is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, and therefore all rejected claims, recites that the two substances having different dielectric constants are "periodically distributed in a three dimensional space". A careful review of the reference has not revealed any teaching or suggestion of any material being periodically distributed in a three dimensional space. It is also noted that the Office Action does not aver such a configuration is disclosed. The passages noted in the Action describe a copper laminate having vias filled with solder but that description does not imply anything is periodically distributed; also it cannot, of course, anticipate those claims which call for one material to be air.

Applicants have not found any description which provides a basis for asserting that the missing feature is obvious. Since a characteristic of the structure recited in the independent claim is absent, a novelty rejection is untenable. Since inclusion of the

characteristic is not obvious, a rejection under Section 103 would have been untenable, if one had been made. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted the rejection should be withdrawn.

While not strictly necessary in light of the foregoing, applicants respectfully disagree with the implied assertion in the Office Action that the terminology “electroless plating film” is a product-by-process limitation. It is a product limitation. Further, “teaching of the use of electroless plating” refers to the specification and not any claim language.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: August 22, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Edward A. Meilman  
Edward A. Meilman  
Registration No.: 24,735  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP  
1177 Avenue of the Americas  
41st Floor  
New York, New York 10036-2714  
(212) 277-6500  
Attorney for Applicant